

## REMARKS

In the present response, claim 35 is amended. This amendment was not done for reasons relating to overcoming any cited articles and support is found throughout the originally submitted application.

Claims 3-7, 9-11, 13-14, 18-20, 23, and 25-35 are pending.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

In the Office Action, claim 35 is rejected under 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action states that if a local source is selected (in claim 34), and as long as claim 34 does not specifically recite at least the presence and capability of both a local and remote resource, then claim 35 remains indefinite.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Claim 34 recites the capability of both a local and remote resource. A and/or B is readily understood as A, B, or (A and B). Claim 35 had properly narrowed the scope of claim 34 by reciting the presence of both, i.e., A and B. Nevertheless, in the interest of furthering prosecution, the Applicants have amended claim 35 such that it does not depend upon claim 34. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action claims 27, 29, 31-35, 3-4, 6-7, 13-14, 18, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter “Blinn”) in view of Nazem (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227) (hereinafter “Nazem”) and in view of Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter “Bijnagte”).

Claim 27 recites an apparatus for the provisioning of information pages comprising:

a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions that implements an information server for receiving a uniform resource locator (URL) comprising a server name immediately followed by a

separator immediately followed by an identifier interpreted by the information server as a product identifier identifying a product, and in response, constructing and issuing one or more queries including the product identifier to retrieve information corresponding to the identified resource product and dynamically generating instructions to create the associated information page for the identified resource product for provisioning to a client; and

a processor coupled to the storage device to execute the stored executable instructions.

In the Office Action, it is conceded that Blinn (and assumedly Bijnagte, which is relied upon for another element altogether) does not teach a resource identifier immediately following a server name. However, the Office Action goes on to state, Nazem teaches a URL with a server name (quote.yahoo.com) with a resource identifier call to Dow Jones immediately after said server (quotes?SYMBOLS=<sup>^</sup>DJI&detailed=t). While the Office Action referenced “resource identifier” rather than “product identifier,” as used in the claims, for purposes of the following analysis the Applicants will assume it was Examiner’s intent to change “resource” to “product.”

The claim language recites “a server name immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by an identifier interpreted...as a product identifier.” The only arguable identifier that could be fairly interpreted as a “product identifier” in the referenced portion of Nazem is the “<sup>^</sup>DJI,” which the Applicants assume for the purposes of discussion is a ticker symbol for the Dow Jones Industrial average. Even assuming that <sup>^</sup>DJI was a product identifier, <sup>^</sup>DJI does not immediately follow the separator (which immediately follows the server name). The query script language “quotes?SYMBOLS=” is between the separator and the product identifier.

A person skilled in the art interpreting the claim language in light of the specification would recognize the significant differences between the claim language and what is taught by Nazem. Providing the identifier immediately following the separator, as recited in claim 27, may allow a user to request information about a product without having to know the structure of a query script, e.g., by providing a URL

having only a server name and a product identifier. See Column 4, lines 36-40; column 9, lines 25-28; column 9, lines 51-63.

The teachings of Nazem, on the other hand, require knowledge of a query script syntax that is most likely incomprehensible to most users, which is why the URL is most likely automatically supplied as a result of a user activating a hyperlink, e.g., clicking on a “DJI” link.

Because the cited articles fail to teach, suggest or imply at least the quoted limitation of claim 27, this claim is patentably distinct from the cited articles. Furthermore, the remaining pending claims, either depend from, or include limitations similar to, claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the cited articles for at least these reasons.

In the Office Action claims 9-11, 19-20 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and further in view of Anderson et al. (US Pat. No. 5,974,396) (hereinafter “Anderson”).

These claims depend from, or include elements similar to, claim 27 discussed above. Because the combination of Blinn, Nazem and Bijnagte does not make claim 27, as a whole obvious, and because Anderson does not correct for the above noted deficiencies, these claims are also patentable over this combination.

In the Office Action claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and further in view of Kirkevold et al. (US Pat. No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter “Kirkevold”).

Claim 5 depends indirectly from claim 27 discussed above. Because the combination of Blinn, Nazem and Bijnagte does not make claim 27, as a whole obvious, and because Kirkevold does not correct for the above noted deficiencies, this claim is also patentable over this combination.

**Conclusion**

Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 04/24/2006

  
Nathan R. Maki  
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981